1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of the State of California	
2	DANE R. GILLETTE	
3	Chief Assistant Attorney General GARY W. SCHONS	
4	Senior Assistant Attorney General ERIKA HIRAMATSU	*
5	Deputy Attorney General MATTHEW MULFORD	
6	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 184000	
7	110 West A Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101	
8	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266	
9	San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 645-2227 Fax: (619) 645-2271	
10	Email: Matthew.Mulford@doj.ca.gov	
11	Attorneys for Respondent	
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTR	ICI OF CALIFORNIA
14	EDWARD DEVAID CHILINAN	00CN040C DEN (4 ID)
15	EDWARD REYNIR SULLIVAN,	08CV0406 BEN (AJB)
16	Petitioner,	ANSWER TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
17	V.	Judge: Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
18	MATTHEW MARTELL, Warden,	
19	Respondent.	
20		
21	Warden Matthew Martell files this Answer to Edward Reynir Sullivan's	
22	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus:	
23	Ι.	
24	JUDGMENT	
25	Sullivan is in the lawful custody of Matthew Martell, Warden, California	
26	Rehabilitation Center, after a court trial without a jury for committing residential	
27	burglary while on bail with a prior robbery conviction (Cal. Penal Code §§ 459, 460,	
28	461, 667, 12022.1). On October 10, 1996, the Honorable Laura P. Hammes	

sentenced Sullivan to fifteen years in state prison in San Diego County Superior Court case number SDC117298.

### APPELLATE OPINION

II.

In an opinion dated July 31, 1997, in case number D027227, the California Court of Appeal made numerous express and implied factual findings in affirming the rulings and judgment of the trial court. Sullivan has done nothing to show why the presumption of correctness mandated by 28 United States Code section 2254(e)(1) should not apply to these factual findings.

III.

### AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING IS NOT PERMITTED

Sullivan is not entitled to an evidentiary hearing because he seems to rely on the same facts as he did in the state courts. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2), (e).

IV.

#### **TIMELINESS**

Sullivan's Petition is barred by the one-year statute of limitations under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

V.

# THE AEDPA PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) APPLY TO SULLIVAN'S PETITION

The preclusive standard established by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d), applies to Sullivan's Petition. Where the state courts previously rejected Sullivan's claims on the merits, this Court must deny Sullivan relief unless he carries his burden of establishing that the state court's conclusions are contrary to, or unreasonable applications of, United States Supreme Court authority, or are based on an unreasonable determination of the facts.

27 | / / /

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28 || / / /

1

2

4

6

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

2.7

28

VI.

## SULLIVAN MAY NOT RECEIVE RELIEF FOR ANY NEW RULE OF LAW

The rule of *Teague v. Lane*, 489 U.S. 288, 310, 109 S. Ct. 1060, 103 L. Ed. 2d 334 (1989), bars the application of any new rule of law to any claim contained in Sullivan's Petition. A grant of habeas relief in this case, particularly on any claim that Sullivan's sentence was unlawful under *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 120 S. Ct. 2348, 147 L. Ed. 2d 435 (2000), would violate the principle prohibiting retroactive application of new rules of criminal procedure.

VII.

### STATE COURT RECORDS

The State will provide this Court the records from Sullivan's direct appeal and habeas corpus petitions as described in the accompanying Notice of Lodgment and incorporates these records with this reference. *See* Rule 5(d) foll. 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

VIII.

## **EXHAUSTION**

Sullivan's petition for writ of habeas corpus in the California Supreme Court likely exhausted his claims. Any unexhausted claim, moreover, does not state a colorable claim for federal relief and may be denied on the merits. *See Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005).

IX.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The relevant facts and procedural history set forth in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities are incorporated by reference herein. Except as expressly admitted, the State denies each and every allegation of the Petition and specifically denies that Sullivan's confinement is in any way improper, that any condition of his confinement is illegal, or that any of his rights have been or are being

violated in any way. The absence of a violation of Sullivan's Constitutional rights compels the denial of relief. This Court should deny all of Sullivan's claims with prejudice, deny all other relief, and deny any request for a certificate of appealability. Dated: July 9, 2008 4 5 Respectfully submitted, EDMUND G. BROWN JR. 6 Attorney General of the State of California 7 DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General 8 GARY W. SCHONS Senior Assistant Attorney General 9 ERIKA HIRAMATSU 10 Deputy Attorney General 11 s/ Matthew Mulford 12 MATTHEW MULFORD Deputy Attorney General 13 Attorneys for Respondent 14 MM:adc SD2008700047 15 80257787.wpd 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

28

Document 9

Filed 07/09/2008

Page 6 of 6

Case 3:08-cv-00406-BEN-AJB